

## REMARKS

This Preliminary Amendment is being submitted together with a Request for Continued Examination in response to the final Office Action mailed in the application on March 7, 2005. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 27, 28, and 34-39 are pending. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 and 36-39 have been cancelled and claims 27, 28, 34 and 35 have been amended. Claims 40 and 41 have been added.

A check for payment of the fee for the Request for Continued Examination (\$790) is being filed with this Preliminary Amendment. Authorization is granted to charge our deposit account No. 03-3415 for any additional fees necessary for entry of this Amendment.

The Examiner has objected to the specification under 37 CFR § 1.75 (d) for failing to provide clear antecedent basis for terms and phrases used in the claims. In particular, the Examiner has stated that the specification fails to adequately link the corresponding structure, material, or acts in the specification with the means-plus-function limitations of claims 7-11, 27-28 and 38-39.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 27-28 and 34-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for terminating the software based on the positioning information for the part. The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuhiko et al. (JP 06-267809) in view of Isao et al. (JP 06-036977). The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 27-28, 34-35, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,871,398) in view of Katsuhiko et al. and in further in view of Isao et al. The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17,

27-28, 34-35, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olarig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,446) in view of Katsuhiko et al. and in further in view of Isao et al.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 and 36-39 have been cancelled, rendering the Examiner's rejections with respect to these claims moot. With respect to applicant's pending claims 27, 28, 34 and 35, as amended, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

First, with regard to the Examiner's objection to the specification under 37 CFR § 1.75(d) for failing to provide clear antecedent basis for the terms used in the claims, applicant submits that the specification does adequately link the corresponding structure, material, or acts in the specification with the means-plus-function limitations of claims 27 and 28, as amended. Claims 27 and 28 now recite as follows:

**27.** A connection apparatus for connecting with a remote site, comprising:  
input means for inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning a part; and  
transmission means for transmitting to the remote site data in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site.

**28.** A connection apparatus according to claim 27, wherein said transmission means transmits the data and a GPS signal.

Applicant's specification discloses sufficient structure corresponding to the input means and transmission means limitations in amended claims 27 and 28. In particular, as described on page 27, line 11 - page 35, line 27 of applicant's specification, a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus or aligner corresponds to a connection apparatus for connecting with a remote site such as server 150, and comprises input means, such as console CPU 101 shown in FIG. 4, for inputting an output from a device, such as GPS receiver 108, used for detecting information for positioning a part. The semiconductor aligner also comprises transmission means, e.g. console CPU 101, for transmitting to the remote site (e.g., via communication interface 109 and

communication device 116 shown in FIG. 4) data in accordance with the output. The data may be composite ID data that is a combination of apparatus ID and information for the location of the apparatus (i.e., GPS data), as described on page 31, lines 12-22. Accordingly, applicant submits that the specification complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 6 and 37 CFR § 1.75(d).

Second, with regard to the Examiner's rejection of claims 27, 28, 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, applicant submits that the specification does reasonably provide enablement for terminating the software based on the positioning information for the part. In particular, pages 33-35 and FIG. 10 of applicant's specification disclose that upon a determination by CPU 151 (in step 504 of FIG. 10) that location information contained in composite ID data received from the semiconductor aligner is not within an offset range, communication device 156 is disconnected from the aligner and remote access is terminated (step 511). Accordingly, claims 27, 28, 34 and 35, as amended, are sufficiently enabled by the specification in accordance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Lastly, with respect to the Examiner's rejection of claims 27, 28, 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Schneier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,871,398) or Olarig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,446) in view of Katsuhiko et al. and in further in view of Isao et al., applicant's independent claims 27 and 34 have been amended to better define applicant's invention. Particularly, as noted above, applicant's independent claim 27, which is directed to a connection apparatus for connecting with a remote site, has been amended to recite input means for inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning a part, and transmission means for transmitting to the remote site data in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the

remote site. Applicant's independent claim 34, which has been similarly amended, and newly added independent claim 40, are directed to a corresponding connection method and connection program, respectively.

The invention of amended claims 27 and 34 and newly added claim 40 is characterized by inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning a part and transmitting the remote site data in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site. Such structure is shown, for example, in FIGS. 1 and 4, in which main CPU 110 and console CPU 101 operate the semiconductor aligner, which is connected to a remote server 150 through a communication interface 119 and device 116. Console CPU 101 obtains location information from a device such as GPS receiver 108, which detects information as to the position (latitude and longitude) of the semiconductor aligner, and main CPU 110 inputs data such as composite ID (apparatus identification and location information) from a device such as reticle transport device 112. Console CPU 101 then transmits GPS reception data (location information) and composite ID data to the remote server 150. The data input by and transmitted to the remote site is used as identification in connection with the remote site, and CPU 151 in server 150 determines, based on such data, whether remote access is permitted. The invention is thereby capable of more effectively preventing unlawful access to and use of protected software.

According to the Examiner, the combination of the Schneier et al. patent and the Katsuhiko et al and Isao et al. patents disclose optically reading information on a part for positioning the part, transmitting the information to a remote access destination in order to notify that remote access is permitted (Schneier et al. col. 14, lines 55-60; authorization information read from wafer as taught by Katsuhiko), and transmitting a GPS signal (Schneier

et al. col. 14, lines 33-48). The Examiner further argues that while Schneier et al. do not specifically disclose reading information on a part for positioning the part, Katsuhiko et al. teach optically reading information on a part (Abstract; par. 24) and Isao et al teach a wafer having positioning information on it (Abstract).

Similarly, the Examiner argues that the combination of the Olarig et al. patent and the Katsuhiko et al and Isao et al. patents also disclose optically reading information on a part for positioning the part, transmitting the information to a remote access destination in order to notify that remote access is permitted (Olarig et al. col. 4, lines 31-45), and transmitting a GPS signal (Olarig et al. col. 14, lines 33-48). The Examiner further argues that while Olarig et al. do not specifically disclose reading information on a part for positioning the part, Katsuhiko et al. teach optically reading information on a part (Abstract; par. 24) and Isao et al teach a wafer having positioning information on it (Abstract).

Applicant submits that neither the cited Schneier et al. patent, nor the Olarig et al. patent, alone or in combination with the Katsuhiko et al. and Isao et al. patents, teach or suggest the connection apparatus, method, or program of applicant's amended independent claims. In particular, applicant's invention as recited in claims 27, 34 and 40 requires inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning a part, and transmitting to a remote site data in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site. Such features are not taught or suggested by the cited patents.

Shneier et al. teach a remote gaming system including a central management computer (CMC) and an HTV in which, as disclosed at col. 14, lines 41-46, "HTV memory 100 may also include a GPS derived position enable/disable routine 101 which disables the HTV 20 when position information from the GPS receiver 111 indicates that the HTV 20 is located in a venue

where gaming is impermissible.” Such does not teach or suggest, however, that the HTV transmits to the remote CMC data in accordance with the output from the GPS receiver, or that such data is used as identification in connection with the remote site.

Olarig et al. teach a system for automatically disabling hardware or software features using position data and disclose, at col. 4, lines 31-45, that the software queries the hardware system for the GPS hardware. If the hardware is not operational for any reason, the GPS system will not be used. If, however, the GPS hardware is detected and is operational, the correct software options are selected for the particular target unit. A software request is then sent to the hardware for transmission to the master unit. Thus, the system taught by Olarig et al. teaches disabling hardware or software based on the operational status of GPS hardware, not based on location information detected by such GPS hardware. Moreover, while the Olarig et al. patent discloses sending a software request to the master unit, such does not teach or suggest transmitting to the remote site data in accordance with the output from the GPS hardware, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site.

Katsuhiko et al. disclose reading wafer ID and determining a process condition based on the wafer ID (par. 24). Isao et al. disclose that a target mark 6 is described on a wafer 1 (par. 15), pallet forming portions 4A-4E are selected on the Wafer 1, and 1 to n number of a pallet ID 7 for identifier of a test are selected for each pallet forming portion 4A-4E (par. 16). Isao et al. further disclose that upon detecting the target mark 6, ID 7-1 to 7-n to be tested are specified based on the target mark 6, thereby positioned at a spot 39 of an ID reading device 30 (Abstract).

However, Katsuhiko et al. does not teach that the wafer ID is used as identification in connection with a remote site, and Isao et al. does not teach that the target mark or pallet ID is

used as identification in connection with a remote site, as required by applicant's claims.

Therefore, neither of the systems taught by Schneier et al. or Olarig et al., even if modified by Katsuhiko et al. and Isao et al., would result in the connection apparatus, method or program for connecting with a remote site, including inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning a part and transmitting to the remote site data in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site.

Accordingly, the alleged combinations of the Schneier et al. patent and of the Olarig et al. patent with Katsuhiko et al. and Isao et al., as suggested by the Examiner, would not result in the connection apparatus, method and program of applicant's invention.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims 27, 28, 34 and 35, as amended, all patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that an interview would expedite consideration of this Preliminary Amendment or of the application, a request is made that the Examiner telephone applicant's counsel at (212) 790-9278.

Dated: June 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

*Alexandra B. Urban*

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
T (212) 790-9200

Alexandra B. Urban  
Reg. No. 45,171  
Attorney of Record